

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed May 9, 2003, claims 1-5 and 9-13 have been amended, and claims 18-22 are newly added. Claims 1-5, 9-13 and 18-22 are active in this application, of which claims 1, 5 and 9 are independent.

Based on the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objections and rejections and they be withdrawn.

Priority

In addition to the claim for foreign priority made previously, Applicants herewith submits a certified copy of the priority document attached hereafter.

Specification Objection

In the Office Action, the specification has been objected to because the current specification does not comply with the Paper Requirement under 37 C.F.R. §1.52 and MPEP 608.01. In this response, Applicants submit herewith a substitute specification in separate papers, in which the top margin has been increased to be at least 2.0 cm, as requested by the Examiner.

It is submitted that the substitute specification filed herewith contains only subject matter from the original specification. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,835,139 issued to Yun, *et al.* (“Yun”) in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,986,726 issued to Murai (“Murai”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 recites “a chassis coupled to said mold frame to fix said backlight assembly and said liquid crystal display panel therebetween, and formed to be gradually thinner as further advancing from a first side adjoining said light source portion toward a second side facing said first side”.

In this regard, the Examiner admitted “Yun does not disclose ... the particular shapes of the mold frame and the chassis, in the manner as recited in the claims above” (Office Action, Page 4). Regarding these missing claimed features, the Examiner asserted “Murai discloses expressly ... the mold frame (a bottom portion of a metal sheet 1) and the chassis (the engagement portions 11), ... and the mold frame formed to be gradually thinner as further advancing from a first side ... to a second side” (Office Action, Page 4).

The Examiner has not provided any explanation as to where in Murai teaches or suggest the engagement portions 11 (asserted claimed chassis) “formed to be *gradually thinner* as further advancing from a first side adjoining said light source portion toward a second side facing said first side”, as claimed. Based upon Applicants’ review, it is submitted that Murai does not teach or suggest this claimed feature.

As indicated in MPEP 2143.03, “To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art”. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Also, “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art”. *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Since the Examiner has not considered the claimed limitation “a chassis ... formed to be *gradually thinner* as further advancing from a first side adjoining said light source portion toward a second side facing said first side” and Murai does not teach or suggest this claimed feature, it is submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Also, the Examiner asserted that, in Fig. 5 of Murai, the bottom portion of the metal sheet 1 corresponds to the claimed mold frame and the engagement portions 11 of the metal sheet 1 corresponds to the claimed chassis. This assertion is respectfully disagreed with.

Claim 1 recites “a chassis coupled to said mold frame to fix said backlight assembly and said liquid crystal display panel therebetween”, which means the chassis and the mold frame are two separate units that are coupled to each other. Thus, it is not appropriate to divide the metal sheet 1, which is a single unit, into two separate units, bottom portion and engagement portion, and to argue as if these two portions were coupled to each other.

Even if these two portions are deemed to be coupled to each other, Fig. 1 clearly shows the liquid crystal display panel 5 is fixed by the metal bezel 8 and the metal sheet 1. The liquid crystal display panel 5 is not fixed by the bottom portion and the engagement portion of the metal sheet 1.

Again, “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art”. *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). This means no word in a claim should be ignored or discriminated in an attempt to fit the claim into the realm of the prior art. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider the claimed limitation “a chassis *coupled to* said mold frame to fix said *backlight assembly and said liquid crystal display panel therebetween*” in determining the patentability of this claim.

Further, Fig. 1 of Murai teaches the backlight assembly 7 and the liquid crystal display panel 5 fixed between the metal sheet 1 and the metal bezel 8. Applicants believe that it is the metal bezel 8, not the engagement portions 11, that corresponds to the claimed chassis. Of course, both the metal bezel 8 and the engagement portions 11 are not “formed to be *gradually thinner* as further advancing from a first side adjoining said light source portion toward a second side facing said first side”, as claimed.

As described above, the Examiner failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness on claim 1. Hence, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Yun and Murai.

With respect to claim 2, the Examiner admitted “Yun does not disclose expressly the information processing module (23) located from the outside of the mold frame” (Office Action, Page 4). Regarding this missing feature, the Examiner asserted “as noting in Fig. 5, Murai discloses expressly the information processing module (a driver circuit board 4) located from the outside of the mold frame (a bottom portion of a metal sheet 1) and the chassis (the engagement portions 11), for generating and supplying a driving signal to drive LCD panel ...” (Office Action, page 4).

In this response, independent claim 2 has been amended for clarification. Claim 2 no longer recites “... supplied from the outside of said mold frame and chasses ...”. Amended claim 2 recites (a) “A *liquid crystal display* comprising: a liquid crystal display panel ...; a backlight assembly ...; a mold ...; and a chassis” and (b) “said source printed circuit board receives a liquid crystal display panel driving signal supplied from *an outside of said liquid crystal display* and transmits said liquid crystal display panel driving signal to said liquid crystal display panel”.

An example is shown in Fig. 3 of the application, in which the monitor unit 110 receives the liquid crystal display panel driving signal supplied from the main body 100 which is the outside of the monitor unit 110.

In this regard, Fig. 5 of Murai shows “a longitudinal sectional view of an edge portion structure of a flat panel display device 20” (column 5, lines 40-42). As clearly shown therein, the driver circuit board 4 is indicated as an integral part of the flat panel display device 20. Thus, the signal generated from the driver circuit board 4 is *not* from an outside of the flat panel display device 20.

As aforementioned, none of the cited reference teaches or suggests “said source printed circuit board receives a liquid crystal display panel driving signal supplied from *an outside of said liquid crystal display* and transmits said liquid crystal display panel driving signal to said liquid crystal display panel”. Thus, the asserted combination of the teachings from Yun and Murai would not have made the claimed invention obvious. Hence, it is submitted that claim 2 is patentable over Yun and Murai. Claims 3 and 4 that are dependent from claim 2 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Amended independent claim 5 recites “a chassis coupled to said mold frame to fix said backlight assembly and said liquid crystal display panel, and formed to be *gradually thinner as further advancing from a first side adjoining said light source portion toward a second side facing said first side*”.

As previously mentioned, the Examiner failed to consider this feature in determining the patentability of this claim, and this claimed feature is neither taught nor suggested in the cited references. Thus, it is submitted that the Examiner failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness on claim 5, and, hence, claim 5 is patentable over Yun and Murai.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 1-5 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 9-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yun in view of Murai, further in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,475,381 to Williamson, et al. (“Williamson”). This assertion is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9-13 are dependent from independent claim 5. As previously mentioned, Applicants believe that claim 5 is patentable over Yun and Murai since the Examiner failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. More specifically, in determining the patentability of claim 5, the Examiner failed to consider “a chassis coupled to said mold frame to fix said backlight assembly and said liquid crystal display panel, and formed to be *gradually thinner as further advancing from a first side adjoining said light source portion toward a second side facing said first side*”. Also, this claimed feature is neither taught nor suggested in the cited references.

Williamson is directed to a high speed infrared communication system comprising a liquid crystal display 12 in Fig. 1 and a micro-controller 56 in Fig. 2. However, Williamson fails to cure the deficiency from the teachings from Yun and Murai. Particularly, Williamson is absolutely silent as to “a chassis coupled to said mold frame to fix said backlight assembly and said liquid crystal display panel, and formed to be *gradually thinner as further advancing from a first side adjoining said light source portion toward a second side facing said first side*”, as recited in claim 5.

Since none of the applied reference teaches or suggests this claimed feature, it is submitted that claim 5 is patentable over Yun, Muray and Williamson. Claims 9-13 that are

dependent from claim 5 would be also patentable at least for the same reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 9-13 be withdrawn.

Other Matters

In this response, claims 1-5 and 9-13 have been amended solely for better wording and for correcting informalities therein.

Claims 18-22 have been newly added to cover Figs. 7-14 of the present application.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 1-5, 9-13 and 18-22 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: July 23, 2003

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/kbs

**Attachment: SUBSTITUTE SPECIFICATION
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE PRIORITY DOCUMENTS**